UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,252	02/21/2002	Yasumasa Mizushima	SON-2058/YAM	9700
7590 01/03/2007 Ronald P Kananen Rader Fishman & Grauer Suite 501 1233 20th Street NW Washington, DC 20036			EXAMINER LANEAU, RONALD	
			3714	
			SHORTENED STATISTO	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE
3 MONTHS		01/03/2007	DADED	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

N		
1,	~//	
v	' X -	
7	/}	
	v	

09/980,252	MIZUSHIMA ET AL.		
	WILLOOF HAVE CELL THE.		
Office Action Summary Examiner	Art Unit		
Ronald Laneau	3714		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the co Period for Reply	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailling date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ely filed he mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2006.			
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453	3 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims	•		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 37-43 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 37-43 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
Application Papers			
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office A 	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 	on No d in this National Stage		
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	e		

The amendment filed on 10/3/06 has been entered. Claims 1-36 are canceled and claims 1.

37-43 have been pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. The indicated allowability of claims 37-43 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered

reference(s) to Bjerre et al (US 2005/0091089 A1). Rejections based on the newly cited

reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all 3.

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the

manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 37-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjerre et al

(US 2005/0091089 A1).

As per claims 37-43, Bierre discloses a drafting method of a draft of a bill of lading,

said method comprising the steps of: performing pre-booking of a specific outgoing vessel

schedule selected among previously obtained outgoing vessel schedule information at a time of

receiving a consigning order of cargo delivery, and using information concerning a designated

outgoing vessel schedule as draft information for the bill of lading (page, [0072]); issuing a

booking instruction of the outgoing vessel schedule information for confirmation returned with

an attached bill reservation number of the bill of lading; making new draft information for the

1290, 48 F.2d 958, 9 USPQ 220.

bill of lading by adding shipping instruction information to the outgoing vessel schedule information for confirmation in response to a shipping requirement; and transmitting the new draft information for the bill of lading as final draft information for the bill of lading (page 6, [0072] – page 7, [0079]). Bjerre does not disclose an automatic draft information of the bill of lading but it is well settled that it is not "invention" to provide an automatic means to replace manual activity which has accomplished the same result. In re Rundell, 18 CCPA

Response to Arguments

- 5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 37-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald Laneau whose telephone number is (571) 272-6784. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (571) 272-6788. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ronald Daneou

Ronald Laneau

Primary Examiner 12 26 06 Art Unit 3714

rl